

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated June 9, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are pending. In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected to by the Examiner. In this reply, there is no Amendment. Reconsideration of the Application, referring the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kono et al.** (US 2001/0043291, hereinafter “Kono”) in view of **Nakanishi et al.** (US 6,781,642, hereinafter “Nakanishi”), and in further view of **Arledge et al.** (US5,436,744, hereinafter “Arledge”). Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono in view of Nakanish, and in further view of Arledge as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of **Murakami et al.** (US 6,570,707, hereinafter “Murakami”).

Applicant respectfully submits that Kono, Nakanishi, Arledge and Murakami, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the combined features recited in independent claims 1 and 9 of the present application.

On pages 3~4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner mentions that Kono does no disclose “wherein the FPC extended to a rear side of the display device for applying signal voltages to the metal electrodes, wherein the FPC is bent over an edge of the upper and lower substrates form a top to a bottom of the display device, having the second part overlapped the driver IC, wherein the driver IC arranged on the rear side of the display device, wherein a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren’t directly contact with the driver IC.” Also, the Examiner says that Nakanish and Arledge show the insufficient feature of Kono.

However, these indications are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Nakanishi does not clearly disclose at least the feature of “wherein the driver IC arranged on the rear side of the display device, wherein a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren’t directly contact with the driver IC.”

Fig 6 of Nakanishi seems to show that the driver IC is arranged on the rear side of the display device. However, considering unevenness of the control circuit 44, the control circuit 44 cannot be directly formed on the rear side of the LCD device. In lines 22~24 of column 7, Nakanish merely shows that the TTP 41 and the LCD device 43 are coupled with the control circuit 44 by respective flexible wiring boards 47, 48 provided therefrom. That means there is electrical connection between TTP 41/LCD 43 and the control circuit 44. This is different from the feature of “wherein the drive IC arranged on the rear side of the display device, wherein a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren’t in direct contact with the driver IC.”

Further, the Examiner refers to the new cited reference of Arledge in rejecting the above feature.

However, referring to Figs. 3~5 of Arledge, Arledge definitely shows that the drive IC 70 and the conductive runner 66 contact each other through the through conductive via 68 since the drive IC 70 connects an electric signal to the conductive runner 66.

In contrast, the claimed invention discloses the feature of “wherein the driver IC arranged on the rear side of the display device, wherein a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable

connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren't directly contact with the driver IC." This prevents electrostatic discharge between the drive IC and FPC by avoiding direct contact therebetween. There is no electrical connection between the drive IC and FPC in the claimed invention. Arledge cannot show or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention due to differences of structure and effect over the claimed invention.

Also, Applicant submits Murakami does not cure the deficiency, because there is no disclosure or suggestion to show the position of through holes and the relation between the driver IC and through holes.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable over Kono, Nikanishi, Arledge and Murakami for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 9.

Applicant notes that claims 4, 5, 7, 8 each depend from independent base claim 1 and that each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 1, while claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 each depends from independent base claim 9 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are each allowable over Kono and the other cited references at least based on their dependencies and for the reasons given for the respective base claims 1 and 9.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 8, 2008

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants